

Kleene, Rogers and Rice Theorems Revisited in C and in Bash

Salvatore Caporaso

(caporaso@di.uniba.it)

Nicola Corriero

(nicolacorriero@gmail.com)

Dipartimento d'Informatica dell'Università di Bari

Abstract

The recursion theorem in the weak form $\{e\}(z) = x(e, z)$ (universal function not needed) and in Rogers form $\phi_{\phi_{f(n)}}(z) = \phi_n(z)$, and Rice theorem are proved a first time using programs in C, and a second time with scripts in Bash.

1 Introduction

One of the cornerstones of recursion theory is the result known as $S - m - n$ theorem (in honour of the original notation by Kleene, who called it *Iteration Theorem*) or as *Parameter Theorem* (after Schoenfield). Its proofs in Literature however are not fully satisfactory for a computer scientist. Some authors merely appeal to Church thesis (Rogers [6], Cutland [1], Enderton [2]). Some others arithmetize the metaprocessing, and this disguise the computation under a misleading plenty of numerical technicalities (Kleene [5], Smorynski[7]). The proof by Kechris and Moschovakis [3] use a universal function, which is not available when classes of total functions are discussed, like in the case, for example, of security or complexity classes. Among the consequences of the $S - m - n$ we have the Kleene weak form of the Recursion Theorem (existence of a fixed-point value), the Rogers form (functional fixed-point), Rice theorem, the analysis by Thompson [8] in his Turing lecture of relationship between malware and Quine's indirect self-referential paradox. We feel that simple idea need simple programs, and that, therefore, understanding these phenomena needs their revisitation in terms of *real programming*. In this paper we show that this is rather easy in C; and even easier in a language allowing quick writing of rough programs like Bash. To this purpose, we code, in both these languages, the procedures needed to prove the results mentioned above.

A by-result of this work is that one can show significant results in a couple of lectures in the context of a beginners programming course: there is no need of the cumbrous paraphernalia of abstract models of computation like TMs, recursive functions or functional programming.

Familiarity with C and/or Bash is not needed to follow the broad outlines of our discussion. To check the details one needs the small amount of information which is contained in Kernighan & Ritchie [4, Ch. 1 *A Tutorial Introduction* pp.5-30]. All additional details about C, and the essential parts for Bash are explained by means of examples.

2 In C

1 Notation (1) Σ is the set of all strings in the alphabet of all characters that may occur in a C source file. $\phi^{(n)}$ is a (partial) n -ary function such that $\phi^{(n)} : \Sigma^n \mapsto \Sigma$ ($n = 1, 2$ often omitted). $\phi(y) = u$ is short for $(y, z) \in \phi$ or $\phi(y) \uparrow$.

(2) **a**, **b** and **c** are autonymous names for the three fixed identifiers consisting of resp. the 1st, 2d and 3d low-case letter of the Latin alphabet. They will play a crucial role throughout this paper.

(3) **r**, ..., **z**, possibly followed by decimal digits, are generic or constant strings.

(4) We are going to discuss the behaviour of certain (C functions defined by) strings **x** of the form

$$\mathbf{x_}()\{\dots \tag{A}$$

where $\mathbf{x_}$ denotes the identifier used in calls to **x**. To this purpose, we write $\mathbf{a=y}$ to mean that the string variable **a** is assigned with **y**. And we write $\mathbf{x:y, z=u}$ if after a call $\mathbf{x_}()$; with $\mathbf{a=y}$ and with $\mathbf{b=z}$ we get $\mathbf{c=u}$. Calls are tacitly assumed to be syntactically correct, and to include all needed directives and declarations.

2 Definition String **x** of the form (A) *standard computes (s-computes)* function ϕ if we have

$$\mathbf{x : y, z = u} \quad \text{iff} \quad \mathbf{u = \phi(y, z)}$$

(**z** absent, and **b** immaterial for $n = 1$).

Notation $\phi_{\mathbf{x}}$ is the function *s-computed* by **x**.

Example Let **id** and **s1** denote resp. the strings (see §3 for **strcpy**)

```
id_(){
    strcpy (c,a);
}
s1_(){
    strcpy(c,a);
    strcpy(b,a); // comment: just to use two variables
}
```

we have $\mathbf{id:y=y}$ and $\mathbf{s1:y,z=y}$ and, therefore,

$$\phi_{\mathbf{id}}(\mathbf{y}) = \mathbf{y} \quad \phi_{\mathbf{s1}}(\mathbf{y, z}) = \mathbf{y}$$

3 Summary of string functions from the standard library Recall that the following functions are defined in `<string.h>`

<code>strcpy(s,t)</code>	$\mathbf{s = t}$ (i.e. t is copied into s)
<code>strcat(s,t)</code>	$\mathbf{s = st}$ (concatenation)
<code>strchr(s,'c')</code>	locates the 1st occurrence in s of character ' c '
<code>strncpy(s,t,i)</code>	$\mathbf{s = \text{first } i \text{ characters of } t}$ (doesn't add <code>'\0'</code>)

In what follows we need the C function defined by **fn=**

```

fn_(){
  int i;
  i=strchr(s,'()');    // pointer to the leftmost parenthesis
  strncpy(t,s,i);
  t[i]='\0';          // because strncpy doesn't do it
}

```

fn takes the definition of a function into the function name, in the sense that we have

$\text{fn}:\text{x}_-()\{\dots = \text{x}_-$

4 Diagonal Substitution Lemma (A variant of the s - m - n theorem). There is a C function ds which s -computes the function $\sigma^{(1)}$ such that for all $\phi_x^{(2)}(y, z)$ we have

$$\phi_{\sigma(x)}(y) = \phi_x(x, y); \quad \text{or, in other terms,} \quad \text{ds} : x = u \quad \text{implies} \quad \phi_u(y) = \phi_x(x, y)$$

Proof. Define $\text{ds} =$

```

ds_(){
  fn_();                                // c=x_
  strcpy(b,c);                          // b=x_
  strcpy(c,"s_(){strcpy(b,a);strcpy(a,\""); // c=s_(){strcpy(b,a);strcpy(a,"
  strcat(c,a);                          // c=s_(){strcpy(b,a);strcpy(a,"x
  strcat(c,"\"");");                    // c=s_(){strcpy(b,a);strcpy(a,"x");
  strcat(c,b);                          // c=s_(){strcpy(b,a);strcpy(a,"x");x_
  strcat(c,"(){}");                     // c=s_(){strcpy(b,a);strcpy(a,"x");x_();}
  strcat(c,a);                          // c=s_(){strcpy(b,a);strcpy(a,"x");x_();}x
}

```

The comments above (at the left of the $//$'s) show that we have $\text{ds}:x=u$ with (up to unnecessary new lines and indentations added for the sake of readability)

```

\texttt{s=}
s_(){
  strcpy(b,a);
  strcpy(a,"x");
  x_();
}
x

```

So, for $a=y$, (1) we put $b=y$ and $a=x$; and (2) we call x with these new values. Hence $x:x, y=w$ implies, as promised, $u:y=w$.

5 Kleene Theorem (A weak form of the Second Kleene Theorem) For each $\phi_x^{(2)}(y, z)$ there is a *fixed point* u such that

$$\phi_u(z) = \phi_x(u, z).$$

Proof. Given x in the form (A), define a new C function by the string $x_0 =$

```

x0_(){
  ds_();
  strcpy(a,c);
  x_();
}
ds
x

```

We have

$$\phi_{x0}(y, z) = \phi_x(\sigma(y), z) \quad (B)$$

because (1) by calling **ds** with **a=y** we get **c = $\sigma(y)$** ; (2) by calling **x** with **a = $\sigma(y)$** (via **strcpy(a,c)**) and with **b=z** we get **c = $\phi_x(\sigma(y), z)$** . Now define

$$u = \sigma(x0) \quad (C)$$

The result follows because we have

$$\phi_u(z) = \phi_{\sigma(x0)}(z) = \phi_{x0}(x0, z) = \phi_x(\sigma(x0), z) = \phi_x(u, z)$$

where we owe the first equality to definition (C) and the second to Lemma 4; and where we get the last two from resp. (B), and (C) again.

6 Note By applying the theorem to the **s1** of §2 we get a *quine* in C, i.e. a function definition that prints itself by means of a so-called *indirect self-reference* of the form

“...” what quoted is ...

This quine includes a comment, which could be replaced by different actions of another kind.

7 The Universal Function One can write a string **univ = univ_()**{... defining a C function which s-computes a universal function, in the sense that we have for all $\phi_x^{(1)}$ and y

$$\phi_{\text{univ}}(x, y) = \phi_x(y). \quad (D)$$

The proof of Theorem 5 needs a few linear-time operations, and, therefore, it holds for almost all total fragments of C. We regard next theorem as a stronger form of that theorem, because its proof, being based on the existence of a universal function, fails with any class of total functions.

8 Rogers Theorem (A strong form of the Second Kleene Theorem) For each $\phi_x^{(1)}(y)$ there is a value v such that

$$\phi_{\phi_x(v)} = \phi_v$$

Proof. Given **x** in the form (A) define a new C function by means of the string **w=**

```

w_(){
  x_();
  strcpy(a,c);
  univ_();
}
univ
x

```

We have

$$\phi_w(y, z) = \phi_{\text{univ}}(\phi_x(y), z) \quad (\text{E})$$

because (1) by calling x with $a=y$ we get $c = \phi_x(y)$; (2) by copying c into a and calling univ with this value for a and with $b=z$ we obtain (by (D) with $\phi_x(y)$ as x)

$$c = \phi_w(y, z) = \phi_{\phi_x}(y)(z) \quad (\text{F})$$

Our assertion follows by taking as v the fixed-point for w which is granted by Theorem §5. Indeed, we then have

$$\phi_v(z) = \phi_w(v, z) = \phi_{\text{univ}}(\phi_x(v), z) = \phi_{\phi_x(v)}(z)$$

where the first equality follows because v is the fixed-point for ϕ_w ; the second by (E), and the last one by (F).

9 Rice Theorem All not-trivial classes of s-computable functions are undecidable.

Proof. Assume (ad abs.) that there is a string $x=x_-()\{\dots$ that s-computes the characteristic function of $\mathcal{A}$, in the sense that we have

$$\phi_x(z) = \text{"0"} \text{ iff } \phi_z \in \mathcal{A}; \quad \phi_y(z) = \text{"1"} \text{ iff } \phi_z \notin \mathcal{A}. \quad (\text{G})$$

Since the class is not trivial there exist s, t such that

$$\phi_s \in \mathcal{A}; \quad \phi_t \notin \mathcal{A}. \quad (\text{H})$$

Define $y=$

```

y_() {
  x_();
  if strcmp(c, "0")
    then strcpy(c, "t");
  else strcpy(c, "s");
}
x

```

we have

$$\phi_y(z) = t \text{ iff } \phi_z \in \mathcal{A}; \quad \phi_y(z) = s \text{ iff } \phi_z \notin \mathcal{A}. \quad (\text{I})$$

Let u be the string granted by Rogers Theorem, such that we have

$$\phi_u = \phi_{\phi_y(u)} \quad (\text{J})$$

We get the following contradiction

$\phi_u \in \mathcal{A} \Rightarrow \phi_y(u) = t$	equation (I)
$\Rightarrow \phi_u = \phi_t$	equation (J)
$\Rightarrow \phi_u \notin \mathcal{A}$	equation (H)
$\phi_u \notin \mathcal{A} \Rightarrow \phi_y(u) = s$	equation (I)
$\Rightarrow \phi_u = \phi_s$	equation (J)
$\Rightarrow \phi_u \in \mathcal{A}$	equation (H).

3 In Bash

10 Notation (1) `foo()` is the string stored in file `foo`. When `foo()` is a script `x` we display it along an indented column (with semicolon omitted according to Bash syntax). For example,

```
eecho()=
  echo echo hi! > hi
  chmod 755 hi
  hi
```

says that file `eecho` contains a script that: *redirects* the output `echo hi!` of `echo echo hi!` from *stdout* (the monitor) to file `hi` (ℓ_1) ; grants the execution permissions to file `hi()`=`echo hi!` (ℓ_2); and calls it (ℓ_3).

(2) We use the sign `->` to show the Bash *prompt*. A line like

```
-> comm arg1 ... argk
```

says that at the prompt command `comm` with arguments `arg1 ... argk` ($k \geq 0$) enters from *stdin* (the console). Below such a line we list the $h \geq 0$ lines that the command sends to *stdout* and the $k \geq 0$ created files. The convention of part (1) allows the distinction between the former and the latter ones. For example, to say that `eecho` creates file `hi` and prints `hi!`, we write

```
-> eecho
hi()=
  echo hi!
hi!
```

To summarize these notations:

(i) a not-indented column like

```
foo()
  x
```

means that file `foo` stores `x`;

(ii) the same column, below `->...` says that `foo` has been created by the command line ...;

(iii) `foo()` alone stands for `x`;

(iv) a not-indented string below a prompt is an output.

(4) `comm1 args1 = comm2 args2` says that `comm1 args1` and `comm2 args2` print the same string — differences in their other effects (f.i. in the created files) do not matter.

11 Summary of useful Bash commands (1) Recall that Bash assigns its internal variables `$1`, `$2`, ..., `$n` with the first, second, ..., n -th argument of the script being currently executed. So, we have

```
id()=
  echo $1
-> id foo
foo
```

Since the command `cat foo bar` sends to *stdout* the concatenation of `foo()` and `bar()`, we have

```

cat2()=
  cat $1 $2
-> cat2 id cat2
echo $1
cat $1 $2

```

(2) Assume

```

-> comm args
u

```

Bash interprets an expression like $\$(comm\ args)$ as a *command substitution* of that same expression with u . For example

```

-> echo $(cat id)
echo $1

```

(3) Command `set arg1 ...argk` assigns $arg1, \dots, argk$ to $\$1, \dots, \$k$. So we have

```

cat2idcat2()=
  set id cat2
  cat2
-> cat2idcat2
echo $1
cat $1 $2

```

12 Note In a script `builder` which produces another script `built`, we include in `builder` the line `chmod 755 built`. In all other cases, we tacitly assume that the execution permissions have been granted to the current script, when it has been edited.

13 Scripts arity The *arity* of script x is, by definition, $n \geq 0$ if the variables $\$1, \dots, \$n$ occur in x . So, the arity of the previously introduced scripts `cat2`, `id` and `hi` is resp. 2, 1 and 0.

14 Notation $\varphi_x^{(n)}$ ($n = 1, 2$) is the function $\varphi : \Sigma^n \mapsto (\Sigma)$ such that we have

```

-> x y z
u

```

iff $u = \varphi(y, z)$ (z absent for $n = 1$).

Note that we don't need any standard of computation now.

15 Kleene Theorem (A uniform and weak version of the Second Kleene Theorem) There is a script `uk` such that for all binary scripts x we have

```

-> uk x
kx()

```

with `kx` such that, for all z we have (see §10(4) for this equality)

```

kx z = x kx z

```

In other terms, `uk` produces uniformly a script `kx` such that

$$\varphi_{kx}(z) = \varphi_x(kx, z).$$

So, we can now get the fixed-point uniformly in `x`.

Proof. We have

```
uk()=
  echo "set k$1 \"$1;$$(cat $1)">k$1
  chmod 755 k$1
-> uk x
  kx()=
    set kx $1
    x()
```

Indeed, when `x` is assigned to `$1` the line `echo...` redirects (via a command substitution similar to the one under part (2) of §11) the string

```
set kx $1;(x)
```

to file `kx`. Since the second line of `uk` makes script `kx` executable, we may conclude, by the semantics of `set`, that `kx z` behaves like `x kx z`.

16 Example Let us apply the theorem with `cat2` as `x`

```
-> uk cat2           // uk with cat2 as x creates executable script kcat2
-> kcat2 id           // kcat2 by input id behaves like cat2 cat2 id
set kcat2 $1;cat $1 $2 // prints (kcat2)
echo $1              // and (id)
-> cat kcat2          // to check this let's use cat to print directly kcat2
set kcat2 $1;cat $1 $2 // indeed this equals the first output of kcat2
```

17 Quine By replacing in the example above `cat2` with

```
self()=
  cat $1
```

we get the rather compact *quine*

```
kself()=
  set kself $1;cat $1
-> kself
set kself $1;cat $1
```

But of course the quine can bring some extra luggage

```

self_plus(:)
  cat $1
  (( a = 9**9 ))
  echo $a
-> uk self_plus
-> kself_plus
cat $1;(( a = 9**9 ));echo $a
387420489

```

18 Definition A *script-maker* is a unary script x that for each string y prints an executable script $u = \varphi_x(y)$ which, in turn, computes a function $\varphi_u(x)$. That is to say that for all x, y there is u such that we have

```

-> x y
  u()

```

and for all z there is w such that

```

-> u z
w

```

or φ_u is not defined at z .

19 Rogers Theorem (A strong and uniform variant of the Second Kleene Theorem) There is a script ur that for each script-maker x yields a script krx such that, for all z we have

$$\varphi_{krx}(z) = \varphi_{\varphi_x(krx)}(z)$$

Proof. Define

```

ur()=
  echo "$1 \"$1 > ${1}_;chmod 755 ${1}_; ${1}_ \"$2" > r$1
  uk r$1

```

For $\$1=x$ the two lines of this script produce the two scripts below, one by redirection to $r\$1=rx$, and the other by application to rx of the uniform procedure of §15

```

-> ur x
  rx()
  krkx()

```

the form of the former is

```

rx()=
  x $1 > x_
  chmod 755 x_
  x_ $2

```

and we have

$$\varphi_{\mathbf{rx}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) = \varphi_{\mathbf{x}_-}(\mathbf{z}) = \varphi_{\varphi_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{y})}(\mathbf{z}) \quad (\text{K})$$

because the script above, when called with arguments $\mathbf{y}$, $\mathbf{z}$, sends $\mathbf{u} = \varphi_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{y})$ to $\mathbf{x}_-$, then computes $\varphi_{\mathbf{u}}(\mathbf{z})$ (line $\mathbf{x}_-$ \$2 with \$\mathbf{2}=\mathbf{z}\$).

The result now follows by Kleene Theorem since we have

$$\varphi_{\mathbf{krrx}}(\mathbf{z}) = \varphi_{\mathbf{rx}}(\mathbf{krrx}, \mathbf{z})$$

References

- [1] Cutland, N.J. *Computability* Cambridge University Press (1980).
- [2] Enderton, H.B.: *Elements of Recursion Theory*. In J. Barwise (ed.) *Handbook of Mathematical Logic*. North-Holland (1977).
- [3] Kechris, A.S. and Moschovakis, Y.N. : *Recursion in Higher Types*. In J. Barwise (ed.) *Handbook of Mathematical Logic*. North-Holland (1977).
- [4] Kernighan, B.W. and Ritchie D.M.: *The C Programming Language*. Prentice Hall, Second Edition (1988).
- [5] Kleene, S.C.: *Introduction to Metamathematics*. North-Holland (1952).
- [6] Rogers, H.: *Theory of Recursive Functions and Effective Computability*. McGraw-Hill (1967).
- [7] Smorynski, C.: *Logical Number Theory I*. Springer (1980).
- [8] Thompson, Ken.: *Reflections on Trusting Trust*,. Communications. of the ACM. 27(1984).761-763.